<center>**REMARKS**</center>

The following is responsive to the Final Office Action mailed on May 13, 2008. The two-month deadline for fell on Sunday, June 13. Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.7(a), the two-month deadline is extended to Monday, June 14, 2008.

At the time the examiner mailed the Office Action, claims 126-154 were pending. By way of the present response, Applicant has: 1) amended claims 126, 132, and 137; 2) added no new claims; and 3) canceled claims 130 and 141. As such, claims 126-129, 131-140, and 142-154 are now pending. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application and the allowance of all claims now represented.

<center>*Examiner Interview*</center>

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Bashore for conducting telephone interviews on July 1 and 14, 2008 to discuss the claims of the application and the significance of the prior art in relation to the claims. Specifically, the parties discussed the features of dependent claim 130 and how these features are not disclosed in the references cited by the Office. Accordingly, Applicant has amended some of the claims to ensure that all of the independent claims contain the features of/similar to claim 130. As such, no new search is necessitated by these amendments.

<center>*Claim Rejections*</center>
<center>35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections</center>

The Examiner rejected claims 126-127, 129-134, 136-138, 140-146, 148-154 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Omniform User's Manual (hereinafter "OmniForm") in view of Hitchcock, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,460,042 (hereinafter "Hitchcock") and Millman, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,619,635 (hereinafter "Millman").

OmniForm describes the <u>generation of an HTML form</u> and the editing of an existing <u>form</u> by a user. This editing may be performed through a GUI. (OmniForm, e.g., page 32.)

Appl. No.: 09/669,594   10   Atty. Docket No.: 004426.P001
Amdt. dated 07-14-08
Reply to the Office action of 05/13/2008

Hitchcock describes a forms engine for data sharing between customizable forms. Specifically, Hitchcock allows a user to input data into a forms engine once and allow the engine to auto-populate varying forms using the data entered. (Hitchcock, col. 7 ll.19-29). In the sections cited by the Office Action, Hitchcock describes generating a form from directives. (Hitchcock, col.10 ll.42-65) .

Millman describes a system for creating complex forms by generating a set of form specifications defining the structure, design, and manufacturing techniques associated with the publication of the respective form. In the sections cited by the Office Action, Millman describes locking portions of the form considered "final" so that those portions may not be further edited during creation of the form. (Millman, col. 10, ll. 38-40).

None of the references discloses creating program code.

The combination of references fails to teach or suggest what Applicant's claims require. With respect to claim 126, the combination does not describe:

> A method comprising:
> receiving, through a network, a form authored using a form authoring language, the form containing one or more input fields;
> parsing the received form to identify the input fields contained in the received form;
> providing a graphical user interface to allow identification of one or more actions to be associated with the identified input fields upon subsequent specific submission of a specific instance of the form by a third party, the provided graphical user interface being dependent on the identified input fields;
> automatically generating a program code to carry out the actions associated with the identified input fields, wherein no modifications to the input fields of the form are made by the generation of the program code;
> receiving a specific submission of the form from a third party, including data added by the third party into the input fields; and
> executing the program code on the received data from the specific submission of the form from the third party to carry out the actions associated with the identified input fields.

The three cited references each describe the generation of a _form_. Nonetheless, the references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the separate, automatic **generation of program code for identified input fields _of an existing form_**.

OmniForm does not teach or suggest generating program code. OmniForm discloses creating a form in which input fields can be automatically formatted (e.g., adding a "$" and two decimal places for currency), restricted to certain values, etc. (OmniForm, pp. 74-77). Nevertheless, this form creation does not teach or suggest the separate generation of program code for identified input fields of an existing form.

Hitchcock discloses directives for matching input data to input fields by means of a look-up table. (Hitchcock, col. 10, ll. 43-47). Completed forms varying in format are generated based on single entry of common user data. Once a form is created, there is no generation of separate program code for identified input fields of an existing form.

Finally, as Millman teaches automating the process of form creation in terms of specifications for publication, it too fails to teach or suggest this claim feature.

Additionally, the references fail to teach or suggest that no modifications to the input fields of the form are made by the generation of the program code. As none of the references teaches automatically generating the program code for identified input fields of an existing form in the first place, Applicant respectfully submits that it logically follows that none of the references teaches that generation of program code makes no modifications to the input fields of the form.

Nevertheless, the Office Action submits that OmniForm (and impliedly Hitchcock) fails to teach or suggest this claim feature. (Office Action mailed 5/13/08, page 3). As described above, OmniForm describes automatically formatting contents of a form, which are modifications to the input fields of the form. The Office Action then cites Millman as teaching this claim feature

because Millman describes locking portions of a form from future editing. Applicant respectfully submits that Millman's locking of portions of a form during creation of the form is not described in reference to automatically generated program code that carries out actions associated with the input fields. Millman's locking of portions of a form is directly related to the creation of a form. Furthermore, following the Office Action's arguments, if a user locked all input fields of the form, then the generation of program code allegedly provided by the other references would be worthless, as those references describe editing the fields of the form. Therefore, the combination of references would fail to function.

The references, alone or in combination, also fail to teach or suggest **executing the program code on a specific submission of the form** from a third party to carry out the actions associated with the identified input fields. This claim feature was previously presented in claim 130. In its rejection, the Office Action stated that claim 130 "incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 126, and is rejected along the same rationale." (Office Action mailed 5/13/08, page 4). Applicant respectfully disagrees. The additional claim features include additional limitations that merit examination: "Distilling an invention down to the 'gist' or 'thrust' of an invention disregards the requirement of analyzing the subject matter 'as a whole.'" (MPEP 2141.02 citing *W.L. Gore & Assoc. v. Garlock*). It is submitted that the references not only fail to teach or suggest automatically generating program code for identified input fields of an existing form, but also executing the automatically generated program code in response to receiving a form submitted by a third party and carrying out the actions in the program code associated with the inputs in identified input fields as filled out by that third party.

Accordingly, the combination does not describe what Applicant claim 126 requires. Claims 127-131 are dependent on claim 126 and are allowable for at least the same reason.

With respect to claim 132, the combination does not describe:

> A server comprising:
> a communications device connected to a network to receive a form from a client connected to the network, the form authored using a form authoring language and containing one or more input fields;
> a memory coupled to the communications device to store the received form;
> a parser module coupled to the memory to parse the received form to identify the input fields contained in the received form;
> a configurer module coupled to the parser module to create a graphical user interface based on the input fields identified by the parser module, and to provide the graphical user interface using the communications device to allow the identification of actions to be associated with the identified input fields upon subsequent submission of a specific instance of the form by a third party;
> a code generator module coupled to the configurer module to automatically generate a program code to carry out the actions identified, wherein no modifications to the input fields of the form are made by the identification of actions to be associated with the input fields; and
> a controller module to execute the program code on received data from a specific submission of the form from a third party to carry out the actions associated with the identified input fields, wherein the specific submission of the form from the third party includes data added by the third party into the input fields.

As discussed above, the cited references describe the generation of a form. The references, alone or in combination, fail to describe the automatic generation of program code for identified input fields of an existing form, that the program code does not modify the input fields, and that the program code is executed in response to a submission of a specific instance of the form.

Accordingly, the combination does not describe what Applicant claim 132 requires. As claims 133-136 are dependent on claim 132, Applicant submits that claims 133-136 are allowable for at least the same reason.

With respect to claim 137, the combination does not describe:

> A machine-readable medium containing data representing instructions that, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform operations comprising:
>
> > receiving, through a network, a form authored using a form authoring language, the form containing one or more input fields;
> >
> > parsing the received form to identify the input fields contained in the received form;
> >
> > providing a graphical user interface to allow identification of one or more actions to be associated with the identified input fields upon subsequent submission of a specific instance of the form by a third party, the provided user graphical user interface being dependent on the identified input fields;
> >
> > automatically generating a program code to carry out the actions associated with the identified input fields, wherein no modifications to the input fields of the form are made by the generation of the program code;
> >
> > receiving a specific submission of the form from a third party, including data added by the third party into the input fields; and
> >
> > executing the program code on the received data from the specific submission of the form from the third party to carry out the actions associated with the identified input fields.

As discussed above, the cited references describe the generation of a form. The references, alone or in combination, fail to describe the automatic generation of program code for identified input fields of an existing form, that the program code does not modify the input fields, and that the program code is executed in response to a submission of a specific instance of the form.

Accordingly, the combination does not describe what Applicant claim 137 requires. As claims 138-142 are dependent on claim 137, Applicant submits that claims 133-136 are allowable for at least the same reason.

With respect to claim 143, the combination does not describe:

> A method comprising:

receiving, through a network, a form authored using a form authoring language, the form containing one or more input fields;

parsing the received form to identify the input fields contained in the received form;

providing a graphical user interface to allow identification of an action[[s]] to be associated with one of the identified input fields upon subsequent submission of a specific instance of the form by a third party, the provided user graphical user interface being dependent on the identified input fields;

automatically generating a program code to carry out the actions associated with the identified input field, wherein the program code does not modify the input fields of the form;

receiving a specific instance of the form, including data input into the input fields; and

executing the program code on the received data from the specific submission of the form to carry out the actions associated with the identified input field.

As discussed above, the cited references describe the generation of a form. The references, alone or in combination, fail to describe the automatic generation of program code for identified input fields of an existing form, that the program code does not modify the input fields, and that the program code is executed in response to a submission of a specific instance of the form.

Accordingly, the combination does not describe what Applicant claim 143 requires. As claims 144-154 are dependent on claim 143, Applicant submits that claims 144-154 are allowable for at least the same reason.

Claims 128, 135, and 139 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over OmniForm, Hitchcock, and Millman in further view of PR NewsWire, March 22, 1999, ProQuest Direct, pages 1-5 (hereinafter "PR Newswire"). As the addition of PR Newswire also does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the independent claims, Applicant submits that claims 128, 135, and 139 are allowable for at least the same reason.

Claim 147 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over OmniForm, Hitchcock, and Millman in further view of Davis, et al., (hereinafter "Davis"). As the addition of Davis also does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 143, Applicant submits that claim 147 is allowable for at least the same reason.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account Number 02-2666. If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Ryan W. Elliott at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 7/14/08   /Ryan W. Elliott/
Ryan W. Elliott
Reg. No.: 60,156

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300